

REMARKS

Summary of Amendments

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 3, 7, and 16 as indicated above. Applicant has added Claims 19, 20, and 21. Applicant has canceled Claim 4. Accordingly, Claims 1-3 and 5-21 remain pending after entry of these amendments.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Miles, (Patent Application No. 2006/0262126). The Examiner also rejects Claims 16-18 under 102(e) as being anticipated by Stumbo et. al. (Patent Application No. 2006/0256059). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Discussion of Rejection of Claims 1, 7 and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Miles nor Stumbo expressly or inherently teach each and every element of Applicant's claimed method and system for a driver voltage adjuster as recited in Claims 1, 7 and 16. "Invalidity for anticipation requires that all of the elements and limitations of the claim are found within a single prior art reference.... There must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention." *See Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.* 927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The Examiner rejects Claim 1 asserting that Miles teaches all of the elements of Claim 1 in figures 4 and 9. *Office Action* at page 2. Claim 1, as amended, recites "wherein the voltage adjuster further comprises a resistor divider network to lower the address voltage amplitudes that are provided by the standard display driver." Applicant respectfully submits that Miles does not disclose this feature anywhere in the specification. In the *Office Action*, the Examiner took the position that row and column drivers 924 and 928 of Miles correspond to the recited voltage adjuster. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 recites generally a voltage adjuster to reduce the voltage that is provided by the display driver. Applicant respectfully submits the Examiner has failed to identify in Miles any structure for reducing the voltage provided by drivers 924 and 928. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that drivers 924

and 928 are not resistor driver networks as claimed. Therefore, since Miles fails to teach or suggest at least this feature, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is in condition for immediate allowance.

Regarding Claim 7, the Examiner asserts that the method of manufacturing an array of modulator elements and an adjuster circuit is disclosed in figures 4, 9, 18 and 19 and paragraphs 128 and 133-138. Applicant recites in amended Claim 7, a method of manufacturing an array of modulator elements and an adjuster circuit comprising, in part, "forming a resistor divider network configured to lower address voltage amplitude that are provided from a standardized display driver." Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 7 is in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 and request that the rejection to Claim 7 be withdrawn.

Finally, the Examiner rejects Claim 16 as being anticipated by Stumbo et al. Specifically, the Examiner refers to figure 3B as teaching "a resistor network comprising: an incoming address line ... a first resistor connected between the address line and a conductive bus ... and a second resistor." *Office Action* at page 6. In the Office Action, the Examiner took the position that the claimed resistor network corresponded to transistors 310 and 322. First, Applicant respectfully submits that as is known in the art, a transistor is not a "resistor." Furthermore, the recited function of the resistor network is to "lower address voltage amplitudes" provided by the standardized display driver. In contrast, the function of the transistors of Stumbo are not configured to lower address amplitudes, but rather to control the application of a voltage to a row or column of pixels in a binary manner. It states: "[a] pair of nanowire row transistors is used to turn pixel transistors that are located along a row trace connected to the pair of nanowire row transistors on and off." *Stumbo*, at [0013]. Thus since Stumbo fails to teach or suggest at least this limitation, Applicant submits that Claim 16 is in condition for immediate allowance.

Further, in view that Claims 2, 3, 5, 6 8-15, and 17-21 each depend on one of Claims 1, 7 and 16, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable for the reasons discussed above.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, the Applicant is not conceding in this

Application No.: 10/772,120
Filing Date: February 03, 2004


application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. The Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that the Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 5/27/2008

By: 
Eric M. Nelson
Registration No. 43,829
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20995
(619) 235-8550

5227270-SRP
050108